

**REMARKS*****Claim Rejections***

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 3,254,522 (Elliot et al.) in view of United States Patent No. 5,553,478 (Di Troia). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant believes that the Examiner's references to Elliot, in the last paragraph of page 3 and paragraphs 1 and 3 of page 4 of the Office Action, should in fact be references to Di Troia.

In Elliot, the hydraulic cylinder 16 does not act as a reservoir. It is merely the hydraulic cylinder component of an air/hydraulic intensifier, as is common in tools of this type. There is no hydraulic reservoir. As is pointed out in Elliot (column 3 lines 50-53), any replenishment of hydraulic fluid has to be made through the threaded hole 120 closed by a screw 122.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Elliot fails to disclose the use of an electrically powered hydraulic pump.

It is agreed that Di Troia discloses a hydraulic fluid reservoir 30, but it does not disclose or suggest a valve in the connection between the reservoir and the hydraulic cylinder, as admitted by the Examiner, and neither does Elliot.

The Examiner alleges that "it is old and well known in the art to provide a valve that can close and isolate the reservoir from the hydraulic cylinder, and also open to allow hydraulic fluid to return to the reservoir when the power to the tool is shut off", however, Applicant's independent Claim 12 specifies that "operation of the tool-actuating device firstly closes the reservoir inlet valve, and then switches on the electric motor to operate the pump". This is not

Serial No.: 10/089,490

Art Unit: 3721

Page 2

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

disclosed in Di Troia, or in Elliot.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 is respectfully traversed.


The other dependent rejected claims (14 and 16-20) are submitted to be non-obvious at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections cited in the Office Action. Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 6, 2004

By:

  
Richard A. Giangiori, Reg. No. 24,284  
James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979  
Attorneys for Applicant  
TREXLER, BUSINELL, GIANGIORGI,  
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.  
105 West Adams Street, 36th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603-6299  
Tel: (312) 704-1890

659119.WPD

Serial No.: 10/089,490  
Art Unit: 3721  
Page 3

BEST AVAILABLE COPY